

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated May 7, 2003, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this application, on September 8, 2003, the Applicant submitted a Request for Continued Examination with Preliminary Amendment. Applicant is submitting this Supplemental Preliminary Amendment to include additional claims.

Claims 1-20 were previously pending in this application. By this Supplemental Preliminary Amendment, Applicant is amending claims 3, 11-13 and 17-20, and is adding claims 21-64. Claims 1-64 are pending for examination with claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 38, 41, 47, 50 and 56 being independent claims. The newly added claims are directed to subject matter that is not taught, suggested or disclosed in the prior art of record. No new matter has been added. The application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 12

Claim 12 has been amended to more clearly and concisely point out the scope of protection. Applicant addressed the rejection of claim 12 in the September 8, 2003 Request for Continued Examination with Preliminary Amendment.

Claim 21

Independent claim 21 is directed to a computer-readable medium having computer-readable signals stored thereon that instruct at least one processor to perform a method of obtaining identifying information of an individual at a first location. The method includes, *inter alia*, an act of receiving instructions from a second location with a receiver, the instructions comprising one of allowing and denying the individual access to a designated area. Musgrave discloses receiving a signal that allows a wireless phone to be used. Neither Wang nor Musgrave discloses receiving instructions comprising one of allowing and denying an individual access to a designated area. For at least this reason, claim 21 and dependent claims 22-28 are believed to be allowable.

Claim 29

Independent claim 29 is directed to a computer-readable medium having computer-readable signals stored thereon that instruct at least one processor to perform a method of obtaining identifying information of an individual at a first location. The method includes, *inter alia*, an act of receiving, from a second location, instructions based on a digital image of the individual and remarks about the individual, the instructions comprising one of allowing and denying the individual access to a designated area. As discussed above with regard to claim 21, neither Wang nor Musgrave discloses receiving instructions comprising one of allowing and denying an individual access to a designated area. For at least this reason, claim 29 and dependent claims 30-37 are believed to be allowable.

Claim 38

Independent claim 38 is directed to a method of receiving at a second location identifying information and remarks regarding an individual at a first location, and transmitting instructions to an apparatus. The method includes, *inter alia*, an act of preparing instructions based on the identifying information and the remarks, the instructions comprising one of allowing and denying the individual access to a designated area. The method also comprises an act of transmitting the instructions to the apparatus. Neither Musgrave nor Wang discloses preparing or transmitting instructions that comprise one of allowing and denying an individual access to a designated area. For at least this reason, claim 38 and dependent claims 39 and 40 are believed to be allowable.

Claim 41

Independent claim 41 is directed to a method of receiving identifying information and remarks regarding an individual at a first location, and transmitting instructions to an apparatus. The method includes, *inter alia*, an act of preparing instructions based on at least one transmission comprising a digital image of the individual and remarks regarding the individual, the instructions comprising an action a user of the apparatus should perform regarding the individual. The method also comprises an act of transmitting the instructions to the apparatus.

Neither Wang nor Musgrave discloses preparing or transmitting instructions that a user of an apparatus should perform regarding the individual. Musgrave discloses transmitting a signal that allows a wireless phone to be used, but does not teach or suggest preparing an instruction that a user of the wireless should perform regarding an individual. For at least this reason, independent claim 41 and dependent claims 42-46 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 47 and 50

Each of independent claims 47 and 50 is directed to a computer-readable medium having computer-readable signals stored thereon that instruct at least one processor to perform a method of receiving, at a second location, at least one transmission of identifying information and remarks regarding an individual at a first location, and transmitting instructions to an apparatus. The method comprises, *inter alia*, an act of preparing instructions based on the at least one transmission. In claim 47, the instructions comprise one of allowing and denying the individual access to a designated area. In claim 50, the instructions comprise an action the user of the apparatus should perform regarding the individual. In both claims, the method also comprises an act of transmitting the instructions to the apparatus. As discussed above, neither Musgrave nor Wang discloses or suggests preparing or transmitting instructions that comprise allowing or denying access to a designated area by an individual. Musgrave and Wang do not disclose or suggest preparing or transmitting instructions comprising an action the user of the apparatus should perform regarding the individual. For at least this reason, independent claims 47 and 50, and dependent claims 48, 49 and 51-55 are believed to be allowable.

Claim 56

Independent claim 56 is directed to a method of obtaining identifying information of an individual at a first location, the method comprising, *inter alia*, an act of receiving instructions from a second location with a receiver, the instructions comprising one of allowing and denying the individual access to a designated area. Neither Musgrave nor Wang disclose or suggest receiving instructions comprising allowing or denying an individual access to a designated area. For at least this reason, claim 56 and dependent claims 57-64 are believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert Lee Thompson, Applicant

By: 

Eric L. Amundsen, Reg. No. 46,518
Neil P. Ferraro, Reg. No. 39,188
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2211
Telephone: (617) 720-3500

Docket No. T0450.70025US00
Date: September 23, 2003